

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Entry of the above amendments is courteously requested in order to place all claims in this application in allowable condition and/or to place the non-allowed claims in better condition for consideration on appeal.

Status of Claims

Claims 1, 8, 9, and 13 through 15 have been cancelled.

No claims have been withdrawn.

No claims have been added.

Therefore, claims 2 through 7, 10 through 12 and 16 through 23 are pending in this application.

Claims 16 through 23 have been allowed in paragraph 4 of the Office Action.

The Examiner's rejections will be considered in the order of their occurrence in the Office Action.

Paragraph 2 of the Office Action

Claims 4 through 7 and 10 through 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sutton, Jr. in view of applicant's admitted prior art.

Initially, with respect to claims 4 through 6, it is contended in the Office Action that:

It is noted that while Sutton does not particularly disclose the additional limitations as specified in the claims the applicant admits that such system is rather conventional and has been used in conventional computing (See applicant own claim 7, lines 2 and 5).

However, claims 4 through 6 do depend from claim 2, which in turn depends from claim 19, which has been indicated as being allowed in paragraph 4 of the Office Action, and therefore incorporates the requirements of claim 19 which have been allowed. Claims 4 through 6 have been amended to remove any recitation of “conventional” which has been objected to, and therefore claims 4 through 6 are submitted to be in condition for allowance regardless of the rejection of claim 7.

While claim 7 may have indicated the inclusion of one or more “conventional” elements, it is submitted that this does not establish that the claimed combination of elements is “conventional” and known. Claim 7 has been amended to remove the recitation of “conventional” and to include the requirements of claim 9, which has been indicated in the Office Action as being allowable if written into independent form, and by the incorporation of the requirements of claim 9 into claim 7, it is submitted that claim 7 now represents the same scope as claim 9 if it had been written into independent form.

Withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of claims 4 through 7 and 10 through 12 is therefore respectfully requested.

Paragraph 3 of the Office Action

Paragraph 10 of the Office Action states that claims 2 and 3 would be allowable if written into independent form with the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

However, claim 2 depends from claim 19 which has been indicated as being allowed/allowable in the Office Action, and therefore claim 2 is submitted to be in condition for allowance in its current form without being rewritten into independent form. Further, claims 3 through 6, which depend from claim 2 (and therefore claim 19), are also submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Paragraph 10 of the Office Action also states that claim 9 would be allowable if written into independent form with the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The above amendment incorporates the requirements of claim 9 into the recitation of claim 7, and therefore claim 7, as well as claims 10 through 12 which depend from claim 7, are believed to be in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

WOODS, FULLER, SHULTZ & SMITH P.C.

_____/Jeffrey A. Proehl/_____
Jeffrey A. Proehl (Reg. No. 35,987)
Customer No. **40,158**
P.O. Box 5027
Sioux Falls, SD 57117-5027
(605)336-3890 FAX (605)339-3357

Date: 2009-09-22